



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,734	04/30/2001	Walter Dixon III	345708003US	3801

28062 7590 05/04/2004

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC
5 ELM STREET
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER

DAS, CHAMELI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,734

Applicant(s)

DIXON ET AL.

Examiner

C.DAS

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shorter, US 6,687,707.

As per claim 1, Shorter (US 6,687,707) discloses:

- ***providing a program having interactions*** (col 11, lines 5-12, "one processing of the local ... attributes supplied by the requesting application" and col 11, lines 59-62, "the process next passes ... whether responses have been received from all object resolution services" and column 4 lines 23-30), the process have both request and response instruction inherently including program having interactions

- ***each interaction having commands with attributes*** (column 11, lines 5-12, column 11, lines 59-62, column 13, lines 12-22)

- ***identifying a sequence of interactions of the program ... identified sequence*** (column 4, lines 23-37 column 11, lines 53-55, column 11, lines 60-65)

- **for each command of the interaction** (column 13, lines 12-15, column 13, lines 21-24)

- **for each input attribute of the command** (column 7, lines 40-50)

- **identifying an output attribute corresponding to the input attribute** (column 9, lines 50-60)

- **setting the resolution of the input attribute ... output attribute** (column 9 lines 50-67, column 10, lines 1-5, column 10, lines 47-60)

- **for each output attribute of the command ... resolved** (column 8, lines 64-67, column 11, lines 60-65).

As per claim 2, Shorter discloses:

- reporting input attributes whose resolution is set to unresolved (column 9, lines 43-45, column 10, lines 58-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3 - 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shorter, US 6,687,707 and further in view of official notice.

For claim 3, (column 10, lines 47-67 and column 11, lines 1-15).

Shorter does not specifically disclose suppressing the reporting of input attribute.

Official notice is taken in suppressing the reporting of input attribute. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the convenient environment for the system management.

For claim 4, (column 10, lines 47-67 and column 11, lines 1-15). Shorter does not specifically disclose primitive type attribute. Official notice is taken for primitive type attribute. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to get the flexibility to reuse the input attribute.

6. ***Claims 5-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishnan, US 6,658,450 and further in view of Shorter, US 6,687,707.***

As per claim 5, Balakrishnan discloses:

- providing a path of execution of the computer program (column 4, lines 51-57, col 5, lines 13-20, column 13 lines 35-40)
- a path of execution identifying a sequence of functions of the computer program (column 4, lines 34-57, column 14, lines 5-55)
- for each function identified in the provided path of execution (column 14, lines 5-55)
- for each input parameter... output parameter is resolved (column 14 lines 5-49), where input parameters are " name" and " age" and output parameters are their values like, " John" and " 32" .

Balakrishnan does not specifically disclose resolving the parameters when a function was previously processed. However, Shorter discloses resolving the parameters when

Art Unit: 2122

a function was previously processed (column 8, lines 1-10, column 8, lines 47-63). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to perform the resolution efficiently.

As per claim 6, Balakrishnan discloses:

- computer program is a command based application (column 15, lines 12-20)
- the functions are methods of object corresponding to the commands (column 4, lines 28-45, col 13, lines 16-20)

As per claim 7, Balakrishnan discloses:

- commands are organized into interactions (col 13, lines 5-15, col 14, lines 55-60), where request/response communication is the interactions

For claim 8, (col 13, lines 6-10, col 14, lines 19-21).

For claim 9, (col 13, lines 6-15).

For claim 10, (col 14, lines 5-20).

For claim 11, (col 14, lines 55-67 – col 15, lines 1-20).

For claim 12, (col 14, lines 5-20).

For claim 13, (col 14, lines 5-20).

For claim 14, (col 13, lines 5-20, col 12, lines 11-15).

For claim 16, (col 14, lines 10-35).

For claim 17, (col 4, lines 27-50, col 14, lines 5-50).

Balakrishnan does not specifically disclose resolving the parameters when a function was previously processed. However, Shorter discloses resolving the parameters when

Art Unit: 2122

a function was previously processed (column 8, lines 1-10, column 8, lines 47-63). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to perform the resolution efficiently.

For claims 18-25 and 27 are the system claims corresponding to the method claims 6-14 and 16 respectively and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 6-14 and 16.

7. *Claims 15, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishnan, US 6,658,450 , Shorter, US 6,687,707 and further in view of Official notice.*

For claims 15, 26, Balakrishnan discloses descriptor of the attributes (column 14 lines 30-35). Balakrishnan does not specifically disclose aliasing for names of attributes. However, official notice is taken for aliasing for names. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide an alternative label or name for some object or group of objects for flexibility.

For claim 28, (col 4, lines 27-50, col 14, lines 5-50).

Balakrishnan does not specifically disclose resolving the parameters when a function was previously processed. However, Shorter discloses resolving the parameters when a function was previously processed (column 8, lines 1-10, column 8, lines 47-63). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to perform the resolution efficiently.

For the rejections of claims 29-36, see the rejections of claims 6-9, 11 and 14-16 respectively.

For claim 37, see the rejection of claim 5 above.

For claim 38, (col 14, lines 5-22, col 10, lines 16-20).

For claims 39-45, see the rejections of claims 6-9 and 14-16 respectively.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is 703-305-1339.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Tuan Dam can be reached at 703-305-4552. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.


CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2122

4/29/04